	ed States Patent A	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 223 www.uspto.gov	Trademark Office OR PATENTS	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/743,653	03/14/2001	Ahmet Mursit Eskicioglu	RCA 89131	7330	
7590 02/06/2007 Joseph S Tripolis Thomson Multimedia Licensing Inc PO Box 5312 Princeton, NJ 08540			EXAMINER		
			DAVIS, ZACHARY A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
i iniccion, NJ C			2137		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/06/2007	PAF	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/743,653	ESKICIOGLU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Zachary A. Davis	2137
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
Period for Reply		
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI(1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON stute, cause the application to become AE	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{10}$	November 2006.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-17</u> is/are pending in the	annlication	
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>7-14</u> is/are withdra		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,6 and 15-17</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	
	•	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		
Applicant may not request that any objection to t		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ian priority under 35 U S C 8	5 119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	.g., priority under 50 0.0.0. 3	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		oplication No.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		
application from the International Bur		~
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l		received.
		· · ·
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
ttachment(s)		
) L Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	/ <u>—</u>	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		nformal Patent Application

U.S.	Patent	and Tra	demark Off	ice
РТ	OL-32	26 (Re	v. 08-06))

•

N

.

Þ

DETAILED ACTION

1. A reply was received on 10 November 2006. By this reply, no claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Claims 7-14 were previously withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to a nonelected species. Claims 1-4, 6, and 15-17 are currently under consideration in the present application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6, and 15-17 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudelski et al, US Patent 5144663, in view of Wasilewski et al, US Patent 5870474 (cited in the previous Office action).

In reference to Claim 1, Kudelski discloses a method for managing access to a restricted transmitted event including receiving and decrypting encrypted access information (column 6, lines 4-10) which includes data corresponding to the price of the transmitted event (column 3, lines 6-13 and 42-50), verifying that the cost of the event is less than a pre-stored cash reserve (column 6, lines 35-41), and receiving and descrambling the scrambled transmitted event (column 4, lines 5-19). Kudelski further discloses that the encrypted access information may be encrypted using any encryption system (column 4, lines 54-57); however, Kudelski does not explicitly disclose using a public key system for encrypting the access information, where the public key is shared.

Wasilewski discloses a system in which a plurality of service providers communicate with a receiver (see, for example, Figure 1, service providers 110a and 110b), where a public key system is used for encrypting access information (see, for example, column 8, lines 31-37) and where a public key is shared by a plurality of service providers (see column 10, lines 31-42, where multiple service providers share key information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Kudelski by including the use of a shared public key, in order to prevent unauthorized users from addressing receivers (see Wasilewski, column 4, lines 12-22).

In reference to Claim 2, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose that the access information includes a descrambling key (Kudelski, column 6, lines 6-10) and purchase information including channel identification data, event identity data, date and time stamp data, and billing data (Kudelski, column 6, lines 11-50).

In reference to Claim 3, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose transferring data associated with the purchased event to update a user's account information (Kudelski, column 8, lines 48-58).

In reference to Claim 4, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose a smart card (Kudelski, column 4, lines 58-63).

In reference to Claim 15, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose that the transmitted event can be audio/video program data (see Kudelski, column 1, lines 17-22; column 3, lines 6-20).

In reference to Claim 16, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose that a service provider can be a television or cable network (see Kudelski, column 1, lines 13-23; column 3, lines 46-50).

In reference to Claim 17, Kudelski and Wasilewski further disclose that the transmitted event can be a package of programs (Kudelski, column 7, line 65-column 8, line 5, where a subscription can be purchased).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kudelski in view of Wasilewski as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of EBU Project Group, "Functional Model of a Conditional Access System".

Kudelski as modified by Wasilewski discloses everything as applied to Claim 4; however, Kudelski as modified above does not explicitly disclose the use of the PCMCIA card standard in the smart card. EBU discloses that a smart card used in a conditional access system may use the PCMCIA standard (page 69, section 3.4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Kudelski and Wasilewski to use the PCMCIA standard for the smart card, in order to allow the system to contain the conditional access system and the descrambler in a single unit (see EBU, page 69, section 3.4).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary A. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3870. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:30-6:00, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

₹AD zad

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER